DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 582 FL 017 462

AUTHOR Garcia, Eugene E.
TITLE Effective Schooling for Language Minority Students. New Focus, NCBE Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education, No. 1.
INSTITUTION National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Wheaton, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 87
CONTRACT 300860069
NOTE 13p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *English (Second Language); *Institutional Characteristics; *Instructional Effectiveness; Language Skills; *Limited English Speaking; Literacy Education; Minority Groups; Oral Language; *Program Design; Program Effectiveness; *School Effectiveness; Student Needs

ABSTRACT

Language minority students can be served effectively by schools that are organized to develop educational structures and processes that take into consideration both the broader attributes of effective schooling practices and the specific attributes relevant to language minority students. Effective classrooms exemplify instructional strategies that build on socialization factors in the population. In some cases, this instruction is characterized by student-to-student communication about academic material, building on culturally relevant interaction strategies and promoting higher-order linguistic and cognitive functioning. Specific effective programs reviewed in this paper include three Phonenix, Arizona elementary school curricula and the J. Calvin Lauderbach School program in Chula Vista, California. A serious body of literature addressing instructional practices, organization, and effects is emerging. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED296582

NEW FOCUS
the national clearinghouse for bilingual education
Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education
ncbe
Number 1
Winter 1987/1988

Effective Schooling for Language Minority Students

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E. Cubillos
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Eugene E. Garcia
University of California, Santa Cruz

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

INTRODUCTION

Educational programs for language minority students have taken on various forms (see Ovando and Collier, 1985, and Ramirez, 1985, for detailed descriptions). Findings from evaluations of language minority education programs suggest that, at the program level, conclusions regarding specific effectiveness of program type remain difficult to draw (see Troike, 1981; Baker and DeKanter, 1983; Willig, 1985; and Hakuta and Gould, 1987, for comprehensive reviews of language minority program evaluation). Rather than emphasizing differences in the effects of various programs the following discussion identifies program and instructional characteristics of education programs serving language minority students.

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

A considerable body of data on effective school practices has accumulated in the last 20 years. Purkey and Smith (1985) reviewed these data and identified the following five characteristics of effective schools:

- **Administrative leadership**
  Effective principals are actively engaged in curriculum planning, staff development, and instructional issues.
- **Teacher expectations**
  Teachers maintain high achievement expectations for all students.
- **Emphasis on basic skills**
  There is a deliberate focus on reading, writing, math, and language arts.
- **School climate**
  An orderly, safe environment conducive to teaching and learning is maintained.
- **Regular Feedback**
  Continual feedback on academic progress is provided to students and parents.

Edmunds (1979) contributed to the emerging picture of effective schools, particularly with regard to minority students. He identified organizational and structural characteristics which facilitate the development of effective schools. These organizational and structural characteristics include:

- **School site management**
  School leadership and staff have considerable autonomy in determining the exact means by which they address the problem of increasing academic performance;
- **Instructional leadership**
  The principal initiates and maintains procedures for improving achievement;
- **Curriculum planning and organization**
  In elementary schools, the curriculum has a clear focus on the acquisition of basic skills. Instruction takes into consideration students' linguistic and cultural attributes across grade levels and throughout the entire curriculum;
- **Staff development**
  This activity is essential to change and consists of a school-wide program closely related to the instructional program. This activity is crucial in schools serving language minority students;

FL017462

- **Parent support and involvement**
  These are essential factors in the success of any educational program for language minority students;

- **School-wide recognition of academic success**
  This feature is reflected in the school's activities; and

- **District support**
  Support is fundamental to change and to the maintenance of effective schools.

Edmunds (1979) also identified four characteristics which act to sustain a productive school climate:

- **Collaborative planning and collegial relationships**
  Teachers and administrators work together in attempts to implement change;

- **A sense of community**
  A feeling of belonging contributes to reduced alienation and increased student achievement;

- **Clear goals and high expectations**
  These are commonly shared. A focus on those tasks that are deemed most important allows the school to direct its resources and shape its functioning toward the realization of these goals; and

- **Order and discipline**
  This characteristic helps to maintain the seriousness and purpose with which the school approaches its task.

Carter and Chatfield (1986) report on similar characteristics in effective bilingual elementary schools serving Mexican-American students in California. Their analyses suggest that processes, rather than structures or pedagogy, administrative arrangements, or classroom organization, are most closely linked to effectiveness. Carter and Chatfield found effective schools for language minority students to be characterized as follows:

- A well-functioning total system producing a social climate in the school which promotes positive outcomes.

- Specific characteristics crucial to the development of effectiveness and thus to a positive school social climate, such as:

  - A safe and orderly school environment;

  - Positive leadership, usually from the formal leaders (administrators, principals, curriculum specialists); and

  - Common agreement on a strong academic orientation which includes:

    . Clearly-stated academic goals, objectives, and plans; and

    . Well-functioning methods to monitor school input and student outcomes.

- A positive school social climate which includes:

  - High staff expectations for the children and the instructional program;

  - A strong demand for academic performance;

  - Denial of the argument that the children are culturally deprived; and

  - High staff morale, consisting of:

    . Strong internal support;

    . Consensus building;

    . Job satisfaction;

    . Sense of personal efficacy;

    . Sense that the system works;

    . Sense of ownership;

    . Well-defined roles and responsibilities; and

    . Belief and practice that resources are best expended on people rather than on educational software and hardware (Carter and Chatfield, 1986).

ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF LANGUAGE MINORITY STUDENTS

Instructional Assumptions

Empirical and theoretical research related to language minority education and specific educational initiatives have generated a number of general assumptions which have guided program development and implementation. Among these are:

1. Students who are less than fully proficient in the language used in school will have difficulty deriving academic benefit from their educational experience, since the inability to understand the language in which instruction is given interferes with comprehension of the content of that instruction;

2. It takes limited-English-proficient (LEP) students time to acquire the level of proficiency in English needed to participate effectively in all-English classes. During the time required to learn English, they will get little out of their school experience if they are instructed exclusively through that language;

3. Instruction in the native language of LEP students allows them to participate in school and to acquire the skills and knowledge covered in the curriculum while also learning English. In addition it allows students to make use of the skills, knowledge and experience they already have and to build on those assets in school;

4. Knowledge and skills are most easily acquired by LEP students in their native language, but computational skills and many literacy skills acquired in the native language can be transferred to the new language once it is mastered. Hence, time spent learning in the native language is not time that is lost with respect to the subject matter covered in school;

5. Students need adequate exposure to the language of school in order to acquire it as a second language. This exposure to English is best when it takes place in settings in which language use is geared to the learners' special linguistic needs. Subject matter instruction given in English can provide the exposure that LEP students need, as long as it is appropriately tailored for them. Subject matter instruction in the school language is an essential component of bilingual education;

6. Formal instruction in English as a second language (ESL) can help students begin learning the language. ESL instruction, whether formal or informal, is an integral part of all American bilingual education programs; and

7. Children, including those served by bilingual programs, have the best chance of realizing their full academic potential when their language skills, social and cultural experience, and knowledge of the world are affirmed in school; these are the foundations of academic development (Wong-Fillmore and Valadez, 1985).

ESL and immersion programs have been particularly influenced by recent theoretical developments regarding second language instruction (Krashen, 1982; Chamot & O'Malley, 1986). These developments have suggested that effective second language learning is best accomplished under conditions which simulate natural communication and which minimize the formal instruction of linguistic structures (e.g., memorization drills, learning grammatical rules, etc.). Although ESL programs continue to involve "pull-out" sessions in which students are removed from the regular classroom to spend time on concentrated language learning activities with specially trained educational staff, the recent theoretical and practical consensus is that such language learning experiences should be communicative and centered around academic content areas (Chamot & O'Malley, 1986).

Comprehensible Input

In immersion programs all the instruction is in English; however, the English utilized by the instructional staff is directly monitored so as to maximize the understanding of the non-English-speaking student. In doing so, the intent of this English "leveling" is to ensure the use of English by the instructional staff in authentic instructional situations while at the same time emphasizing communicative understanding. This practice rests on Krashen's (1982) hypothesis that second language learning is positively related to linguistic exposure in the target language that is just beyond the learner's level of comprehension. The degree to which the student comprehends or understands linguistic input (the level of "comprehensibility") determines the rate at which he/she will acquire the language. Certain attributes of the learner such as anxiety level, motivation to learn and degree of self-confidence may influence his/her degree of understanding.

Social and Cognitive Factors

Other theoretical and empirical research regarding the social and cognitive influences on second language learning are relevant to ESL and immersion programs. Schumann (1976) found that children are more motivated to learn a second

language if they do not perceive this learning process as alienation from their own culture. If a child belongs to a family which attempts to preserve the native language and culture at home, the child may be less motivated to acquire the second language. There may be less impetus for a cultural group to assimilate or acculturate if that group has its own community in the "foreign country" or if the group has lived residence in the foreign country for only a short time.

Not only is the individual's attitude toward the target culture important, but also the relationship between the two cultures influences second language acquisition. Schumann (1976) hypothesized that the greater the social distance between the cultures, the greater the difficulty the second language learner will have in learning the target language. Conversely, the smaller the social distance, the better the language-learning situation will be.

Individual Differences

A child motivated to learn a second language still needs certain social skills to facilitate his or her ability to establish and maintain contact with speakers of the target language. Wong-Fillmore (1976) and Wong-Fillmore, et al., (1985) suggest that individual differences in the social interaction skills of the child influence the rate of second language acquisition. Second language learners who seem most successful employ specific social interaction strategies, such as the following:

1. They tend to join a group and act as if they understand what's going on even if they do not. Learners initiate interactions and pretend to know what is happening. As a result, they have a better chance of being included in conversations and activities.

2. They give the impression with a few well-chosen words that they can speak the language. They are willing to use whatever language they have, and, as a result, invite others to keep trying to communicate with them.

3. They rely on their friends for help. The acquisition of language depends on the participation of both the learner and someone who already speaks the language, in this case, a friend. Children's friends help in several ways. They show faith in the learner's ability to learn the language, and by including the learner in their activities they make a real effort to understand what the learner is saying. They also provide the learner with natural linguistic input that he or she can understand.

Seliger (1977) has demonstrated that the most successful second language (L_2) learners are those who place themselves in situations in which they are exposed to the target language and are willing to use it for communication. These learners receive the necessary input as well as the opportunity for practice. With an emphasis on cognitive (thinking) skills related to second language acquisition, Seliger (1984) and McLaughlin (1985) have proposed two different types of processes related to second language learning. One such process calls for the learner to formulate hypotheses and revise those hypotheses on the basis of language-specific cognitive "strategies." McLaughlin (1984) considers these strategies universal and likely based on innate language-specific cognitive mechanisms (McLaughlin, 1984). These processes include such strategies as over-generalization, simplification, and hypothesis testing. A second type of process assists learners in meeting the specific demands of a particular communication situation. These tactics are chosen deliberately to overcome temporary and immediate obstacles to learning a task. Second language learners may choose to learn the grammar, seek out native speakers, memorize vocabulary items, etc. (Seliger, 1984). In each case, strategies and tactics are viewed as cognitive mechanisms which assist the learner in the acquisition of the second language. Same-age peers have been particularly identified as important in assuring English development in schooling contexts.

Hakuta (1986) likens second language learning to a problem-solving task. The learner will use numerous strategies, hunches, hypotheses, and related cognitive devices to solve the problem. This might include such symbolic devices as the representation of knowledge, organization and the utilization of such knowledge under different circumstances to achieve different goals. Significantly, according to Hakuta (1986) and Hudelson (1987), the learner can transfer all the cognitive knowledge related to the first language (L_1) to solving his second language (L_2) learning "problem." The learner, having determined that language is symbolic, that it is made up of phonology, morphology, and syntax, that it must be communicative, and that it must be structured around certain discourse rules, can rely on such information and related cognitive mechanisms for successfully addressing second language learning. In addition, instructional staff can assist second language learning by focusing on children's

overall second language learning strategies and by not concentrating on the development of specific linguistic skills.

From the above review of second language acquisition theory and research, second language learning seems most effective under instructional conditions which:

- Emphasize authentic communicative learning situations;
- Take into consideration the "comprehensibility" of English interaction;
- Minimize anxiety and frustration and allow second language learners to take risks;
- Minimize linguistic and cultural segregation of second language learners; and
- Maximize the utilization of basic cognitive mechanisms.

Unfortunately, no large-scale body of research is presently available regarding effective instruction in ESL or immersion programs. Baker and deKanter (1983), Willig (1985), Rossell and Ross (1986), Hakuta and Gould (1987), and Hudelson (1987) have each discussed the effectiveness of native language instruction versus ESL and/or immersion. Ramirez (1986) reports preliminary data from a national study which attempts to compare the instructional effectiveness of these diverse programs. These authors differ significantly regarding their recommendations to practitioners, however, all agree that present research and evaluation studies contain significant methodological flaws.

The intent of the present discussion is not to suggest that a "best" instructional strategy now exists for the effective schooling of language minority students. Rather, the aim is to review recent findings which have specifically reported effective instructional strategies. Such findings have been reported primarily for Hispanic language minority students who are receiving native language instruction. The absence of similar reports for other groups of language minority students, and the absence of such data for ESL and immersion programs, underscores the need for such information but also limits the discussion of effective instructional characteristics in such programs. This limitation does not imply that such approaches are ineffective, only that the information is unavailable. However, as Ramirez (1986) and Hakuta and Gould (1987) indicate, data from national comparative alternative programs (particularly native language programs and immersion programs) for language minority students should be available in the near future.

SPECIFIC EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

Specific programs which have effectively served language minority populations have recently been identified. Scholars have sought out effective programs and/or schools and attempted to describe their organizational and instructional character (Tikunoff, 1983; Carter & Chatfield, 1986). The following discussion identifies two such schools which have been the focus of these recent efforts.

Phoenix, Arizona Schools

In a project conducted at Arizona State University and funded by the Inter-University Program for Latino Research and the Social Science Research Council, this author has conducted a two year investigation of the attributes of effective schools serving Hispanic language minority students. This research focused on academic learning. The primary goal of the project was to determine the organizational, instructional, and social characteristics of "effective" schools, their classrooms, and their professional personnel. The research was conducted by an interdisciplinary research team utilizing a variety of analytical techniques to provide a broad ("macro") analysis of the schooling environment and a focused ("micro") analysis of instruction. The research was conducted in collaboration with the Phoenix Elementary School, the Glendale Elementary School, and the Chandler Unified School District.

Approach

Characteristics identified by Purkey and Smith (1983) and Carter and Chatfield (1986) associated with effective schools were assessed over a period of two years. This assessment included a series of interviews as well as an ethnographic description of the schooling environment and the surrounding community. Interviews were conducted and the ethnographic data were collected systematically during the study period in an effort to develop a two-year comprehensive "picture" of effective schooling processes.

Activities of students in instructional school situations as well as in home and community contexts were systematically sampled over the two-year period. The activities sampled were:

- Instructional processes in literacy and math;
- Parental attitudes related to educational materials and educational assistance provided to students;
- Teacher and principal attitudes;
- Student performance on standardized language, cognitive, and metacognitive measures; and
- Academic achievement.

Research Site and Population Studied

The research sites in this study included a total of seven classrooms (Grades K-6) in three Phoenix area elementary schools which had been nominated by local educators as effective schools, and whose students were achieving at or above grade level on standardized measures of academic achievement. Classrooms selected to take part in the study included students from Spanish and bilingual language instruction classrooms.

Results

The results of the study indicate the following:

- **"Macro" Description of Community, Schools, and Classrooms**
  Results of this aspect of the study indicate several "types" of classrooms, each with individual linguistic and organizational characteristics. These classrooms share several significant characteristics, however. In each classroom the key emphasis was on ensuring functional communication between teacher and students and between students and other students. The classrooms were characterized by an integrated curriculum emphasizing thematic organization of instructional objectives and by: (1) student collaboration in almost all academic activity, (2) minimal individualized work tasks, and (3) a highly informal, almost familial, social and collaborative relationship between teachers and students.

- **Instructional Discourse**
  Analyses of audio/video taped classroom "instruction" during literacy and math lessons were conducted biweekly. Results of these analyses indicated that for literacy instruction teachers organized their classrooms in a manner which led students to interact with each other regarding the instructional topic. Discourse characterized by higher order cognitive and linguistic features was observed during these student-student discussions (which occurred over 50 percent of the time). The data also indicated a trend toward greater English language use as the children advanced through the grades. Self-transitioning strategies were observed in student-teacher and student-to-student dialogue journals.

- **Literacy Development**
  Literacy in grades K-6 was analyzed using daily dialogue journal entries, which allowed students to "discuss" topics of their choice with teachers on a daily basis. Results of these analyses indicate that: (1) writing in the native language progressed systematically in the early grades; (2) writing in the second language "emerged" at or above the level observed in the first language; (3) generally, a high degree of conventional spelling was observed at early grades (even when spelling was not an independent "target" in these classrooms); and (4) the quantitative and qualitative character of student journal entries was directly related to the cognitive and linguistic nature of the teacher's responses (Garcia and Barry, 1981).

- **Academic and Cognitive Achievement**
  Several cognitive and academic achievement measures were administered to students. Teachers were also asked to rate student academic success. Results indicate that: (1) teachers at early grades did not assess academic achievement (as measured by academic achievement tests) as proficiently as teachers in later grades; (2) average academic achievement in reading and math for students in these classrooms was at or above grade level; (3) students scored higher on math than on reading; and (4) there was a positive predictive relationship between the cognitive measures and the math academic achievement measures as well as between Spanish language proficiency and English reading achievement.

- **Professional Staff, Parental, and Student Perspectives**
  Interviews with classroom teachers, school site principals, parents, and students were conducted to determine their perspectives and roles regarding education.

  - Classroom Teachers
    Classroom teachers who, on average, had 6.7 years of teaching experience were highly committed to the educational

success of all their students. They perceived themselves as instructional innovators utilizing new psychological and social theories to guide their instructional approaches. All were highly articulate regarding theory-to-practice issues. They continued to be involved in professional development activities including participation in small-group teacher networking, and had a strong and evidenced commitment to student-home communication. Three of these teachers had developed a weekly mechanism for formally communicating about student progress with parents. Each teacher also felt he/she had the autonomy to create and/or change the curriculum implemented in the classrooms even if this activity did not meet with guidelines established by local or state educational agencies.

- **School Principals**
  Principals, who, in this study, averaged 11.7 years of administrative experience were highly articulate regarding the curriculum and instructional strategies undertaken in their classrooms. They were highly supportive of their instructional staff, and recognized the importance of teacher autonomy while also recognizing the pressures to conform to district policies regarding the "standardization" of the curriculum and the need for academic accountability.

- **Parents**
  Parents, who, in this study averaged 7.1 years of schooling expressed a high level of satisfaction with the educational experience of their students. They actively supported the educational endeavors of their children by assisting them with homework, purchasing reading materials. etc., and strongly encouraging their children to succeed academically, viewing this success as a pathway to their children's economic betterment. The support strategies used by non-literate parents were particularly interesting. These parents ensured sibling/peer assistance for homework, "read" to young children by inventing prose to match storybook pictures, etc.

The general impressions of the investigators as they sifted through the data they had collected and as they interacted personally with the schools' various constituents were that these schools indeed served all students well, academically and otherwise. The highest complement that can be paid to a school can easily be directed to those studied in this project: "I would want my children to attend this school."

J. Calvin Lauderbach School, Chula Vista, California

Carter and Chatfield (1986) provide one of the most detailed descriptions of an effective language minority school presently available in the literature. Their work began in 1981 as a California State Department of Education project to identify, describe, and disseminate information relevant to effective instructional programs throughout the State of California. In that project, the J. Calvin Lauderbach School was identified, and descriptive research has been ongoing over the last five years. Lauderbach school is located in Chula Vista, California, a middle-sized city south of San Diego and minutes north of the Mexican-U.S. border. Of the 600 children that attend the school, half are Hispanic, one-third are native English-speaking, and the remainder are Black, Filipino, Laotian, Japanese, or Guamanian. Almost all the Hispanic students have Spanish as their home language and over 50 percent are identified as LEP by local language-testing criteria.

Lauderbach was considered effective primarily based on measures of academic achievement which indicated that the language minority students it serves, most from low socioeconomic levels, were achieving at rates similar to those of middle-class English proficient students in the school. Specifically, Carter and Chatfield summarize:

> The district developed and Lauderbach utilizes a well-developed and quite specific curriculum continuum; a management system parallels this continuum. Goals and objectives are detailed, and grade-level expectations are clear. In most curricular areas rich Spanish-language materials supplement the English continuum. The management system is employed by the school to monitor student learning. Additionally, the district administers a carefully constructed, curricularly valid proficiency test at the fifth grade. Lauderbach students scored remarkably well on this test last year, as they do every year. Seventy-one percent of fifth graders passed all four subtests. This places Lauderbach ninth from the top among the 28 district schools. If one considers only the EO (English-only) non-special-education children, Lauderbach scores second highest in the district with 90

percent passing all four subtests. According to figures provided by the district, Lauderbach ranks twenty-second among the 28 schools in socioeconomic levels, as measured by the California Assessment Program socioeconomic status (SES) scale. The school is in the lowest fourth of district schools socioeconomically but in the top quartile in achievement as measured by district proficiency tests. Lauderbach children appear to be learning very well those things they are taught (Carter & Chatfield, 1986, p. 209).

Lauderbach school offers a comprehensive, team-taught, K-6 bilingual education program. Approximately 70 percent of the students in the school participate in this program, with one-third of these students being non-Hispanic. Collaborative teaching between a Spanish teacher and an English teacher ensures the integration of instructional responsibilities, planning, and curriculum implementation of both Spanish and English instruction. The program receives the strong support of all the school staff and is highly regarded in the community. For each non-Spanish-speaking LEP student an individual learning plan is developed. As in the bilingual program, each student's native language is utilized to assist in the development of concepts and of English skills. This process is usually facilitated by teacher aides who are native speakers of a variety of languages. Of particular significance is the presence of administrative leadership and staff-wide concern for continual school improvement.

At present, it is difficult to identify all the significant variables that promote "effective" instruction for language minority students. More data are becoming available, particularly in the area of language and literacy development (Thonis, 1983; Wong-Fillmore and Valadez, 1985; Edelsky, 1986; Garcia and Flores, 1986; Hudelson, 1987). Unfortunately, most data are concentrated at the early grade levels and rarely address issues relevant to content-area instruction. A recent report (Krashen and Biber, 1988) does, however, report content area academic success for five bilingual education schools in California.

EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES FOR ORAL LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Wong-Fillmore, Ammon, McLaughlin, and Ammon (1985) provide a detailed analysis regarding the effects of classroom practices on the development of oral English in Hispanic and Chinese background language minority students in grades three and five. These students were in classrooms which utilized either the native language and English or English-only during instruction. Specific measures of oral English language production and comprehension were obtained over a one-year period. In addition, classroom observations documented the characteristics of teacher-student interaction, student-student interaction, and the organizational features of instruction. A companion study directly evaluated the effects of classroom practices on those students who had minimal (0-1 years) exposure to English.

These authors report a series of potentially significant observations:

1. Instructional practices which promoted oral English language development related directly to students' initial level of oral English proficiency. Less proficient speakers of English benefited more from high levels of teacher and peer interaction; and

2. The instructional variables related to enhanced English development were different for Hispanic than for Chinese background students. Chinese students seemed to do best in classrooms in which the instructional style was characterized by teacher-directed instruction. Hispanic students, on the other hand, demonstrated enhanced English oral language development under classroom conditions in which there were more opportunities to interact with English-speaking peers exist.

In addition, these researchers reported that the development of English production and comprehension was related to several attributes of student-teacher interaction. Teachers who modified their linguistic interaction based on student feedback were more likely to produce English language gains in students. Such adjustments included simplification of syntax, less rapid speech, and repetition. Allowing and encouraging student participation and calling attention to the structure of language while using it were additional enhancing characteristics that teachers employed.

In recent research which focused on Mexican-American elementary school children, Garcia (1987) reported several findings related to instructional strategies utilized in "effective" schools. These schools were nominated by local public school language minority educators and had students scoring at or above the national average on Spanish and/or English standardized measures of

academic achievement. Garcia's research characterized instruction in the effective classrooms as follows:

1. Students were instructed primarily in small groups and talk about academics was encouraged between students throughout the day. Teachers rarely utilized large group instruction or more individualized instructional activities (i.e., mimeographed worksheets). The most common activity across classes involved small groups of students working on assigned academic tasks with intermittent assistance from the teacher;

2. The teacher tended to provide an instructional initiation often reported in the literature (Mehan, 1979; Morine-Dershimer, 1985). Teachers elicited student responses but did so at levels the students could easily comprehend; and

3. Once a lesson elicitation occurred, students were allowed to take control of the discourse by inviting fellow student interaction. This interaction took place using more complex language and thinking skills.

Teachers in the Garcia study fulfilled general expectations reported by Mehan (1979) for regular classroom teachers and by Ramirez (1986) for language minority teachers. Teachers did not invite instructional interaction in other than the most communicatively simple mode (factual and truncated "answer giving"). This style of instructional discourse may be problematic for language minority students because it does not challenge them to utilize either their native or second language to express complex language functions which reflect higher-order cognitive processes.

However, teachers were clearly allowing student-to-student interaction in the child-reply component of the instructional discourse segment. Teachers encouraged and engineered general student participation once the instructional peer interaction was set in motion. Garcia (1983) suggests that such student-to-student interaction discourse strategies are important to enhanced linguistic development. Wong-Fillmore and Valadez (1985) report that peer interaction was particularly significant for enhancing second language oral acquisition in Hispanic children. Moreover, McClintock (1983) and Kagan (1983) have suggested that schooling practices which focus on collaborative child-child instructional strategies are in line with developed social motives in Mexican-American families.

The Garcia study, much like the *Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study* (Tikunoff, 1983), strongly suggests that teachers can play a significant role in English language development for language minority students. Moreover, this study identifies the potential importance of peer interaction to enhance English language acquisition.

LITERACY DEVELOPMENT FOR LANGUAGE MINORITY STUDENTS

Literacy development is directly related to oral language proficiency. Wong-Fillmore and Valadez (1985) summarized empirical research on literacy instruction for language minority students and concluded that:

1. LEP students can acquire decoding skills relatively easily even when they do not speak English. However, they have considerably greater difficulty making sense of the materials they read;

2. Initial reading instruction in L_1 affects later success in L_2 reading. The ability to read L_1, once acquired, transfers to L_2; and

3. Efforts to develop L_2 literacy without oral language instruction in L_2 are unlikely to succeed. Students instructed in literacy skills in L_1 may take longer to acquire L_2 literacy, but they tend to make greater gains over time.

Similarly, Goodman, Goodman and Flores (1979), after a review of their own work with Papago and Spanish native-language students, concluded:

> In our experience we've found that if bilingual speakers are literate in another language, their development of literacy in English will be easier than for people not literate in any language; and further, their control of English will be speeded as a result of their rapid progress in becoming literate in English. All this assumes that oral and written English are equally needed and functional and that the opportunity to use both is present (Goodman, et al., 1979, p. 22).

A more recent overview of literacy development data gathered from several sites in the United States (Hudelson, 1987) specifically supports this conclusion.

CONCLUSION

It seems clear that language minority students can be served effectively by schools. They can be served by schools which are organized to develop educational structures and processes that take into consideration both the broader attributes of effective schooling practices and the specific attributes relevant to language minority students (Tikunoff, 1983; Carter and Chatfield, 1986; and Garcia, 1987). Effective classrooms exemplify instructional strategies which seem to build on socialization factors relevant to the student population. Effective instruction is characterized, for some students--Hispanics, in particular--by student-to-student communication about academic material. Such communication builds on culturally relevant interaction strategies. It allows students to engage in instructional interactions that promote higher-order linguistic and cognitive functioning.

Although language minority education is in a developmental period and in need of further clarifying research, it is clearly not in its infancy. A serious body of literature addressing instructional practices, organization, and their effects is emerging. The challenge for the classroom teacher, administrator, and policymaker is to consider this literature and to critically evaluate its implications for the classroom.

REFERENCES

Baker, K., and DeKanter, A.A. (1983). An answer from research on bilingual education. *American Education*, 40-48.

California State Department of Education (1984). *Studies on immersion education*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Carter, T.P., and Chatfield, M.L. (1986). Effective bilingual schools: Implications for policy and practice. *American Journal of Education*, *95*(1), 200-234.

Chamot, A.U. and O'Malley, J.M. (1986). *A cognitive academic language learning approach: An ESL content-based curriculum*. Wheaton, Maryland: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.) *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, 3-50.

Development Associates (1984). *Final report: Descriptive study phase of the national longitudinal evaluation of the effectiveness of services for language minority limited-English-proficient students*. Arlington, VA.

Edelsky, C. (1986). *Writing in a bilingual program: Había una vez*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.

Edmunds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership* 37, 57-62.

Garcia, E. (1983). *Bilingualism in early childhood*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Garcia, E. (1986). Bilingual development and the education of bilingual children during early childhood. *American Journal of Education*, *95*(1), 96-121.

Garcia, E. (1987). *Instructional discourse in effective Hispanic classrooms*. Working Paper #3, Bilingual/Bicultural Education Center, Arizona State University.

Garcia, E. and Iserry, C. (1988). *The effect of teacher reaction on students' interactive journal responses*. Paper to be presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association. New Orleans, LA: April 5-9, 1988.

Garcia, E. and Flores, B. (1986). *Language and learning in bilingual education*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.

Goodman, K., Goodman, Y., and Flores, B. (1979). *Reading in the bilingual classroom*. Wheaton, MD: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Hakuta, K., and Gould, L.J. (1987). Synthesis of research on bilingual education. *Educational Leadership*, *44*(6), 38-45.

Halcon, J. (1981). Features of federal bilingual programs. *NABE Journal*, *6*(1), 27-39.

Hudelson, S. (1987). The role of native language literacy in the education of language minority children. *Language Arts*, *64* (8), 827-841.

Johnson, D.M. (1988). ESL children as teachers: A social view of second language use. *Language Arts*, *65* (2), 154-163.

Kagan S. (1983). Social orientation among Mexican-American children: A challenge to traditional classroom structures. In E. Garcia (Ed.), *The Mexican-American child*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University, 162-163.

Krashen, S.B. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergammon Press.

Krashen, S.B. and Biber, D. (1988). *On course: Bilingual education's success in California*. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

McClintock, E., Bayard, M., and McClintock, C. (1983). The socialization of social motives in Mexican-American families. In E. Garcia (Ed.), *The Mexican-American child*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University, 143-162.

McLaughlin, B. (1984). *Second language acquisition in childhood. Volume I: Preschool children*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, Inc.

Mehan, H. (1979) *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Morine-Dershimer, G. (1985). *Talking, listening and learning in elementary classrooms*. New York: Longman.

Ovando, C.J., and Collier, V.P. (1985). *Bilingual and ESL class rooms*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Purkey, S.C., and Smith, M.S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *Elementary School Journal, 83*, 52-78.

Ramirez, A.G. (1985). *Bilingualism through schooling*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ramirez, J.D. (1986). Comparing structured English immersion and bilingual education: First-year results of a national study. *American Journal of Education, 95*(1), 122-148.

Rossell, C. and Ross, J.M. (1986). *The social science evidence in bilingual education*. Boston: Boston University.

Schumann, J.H. (1976). Affective factors and the problem of age in second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 25*, 209-239.

Seliger, H.W. (1984). Processing universals in second language acquisition. *In Universals of second language acquisition*, F.R. Eckman, L.H. Bell, and D. Nelson, (Eds.). Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 161-183.

Seliger, H.W. (1977). Does practice make perfect? A study of interactional patterns and second language competence. *Language Learning, 27* (2), 263-278.

Tikunoff, W.J. (1983). *Significant bilingual instructional features study*. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory.

Thonis, E.W. (1983). *The English-Spanish connection*. Northvale, NJ: Santillana Publishing Co.

Troike, R.C. (1981). Synthesis of research in bilingual education. *Educational Leadership, 38*, 498-504.

Willig, A. C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research, 563*, 260-318.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1976). *The second time around: Cognitive and social strategies in second language acquisition*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University.

Wong-Fillmore L., Ammon, P., McLaughlin, B., and Ammon, M.S. (1985). *Final report for learning English through bilingual instruction*. NIE Report.

Wong-Fillmore, L., and Valadez, C. (1985). Teaching bilingual learners. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*, 648-685.

About the Author

Eugene E. Garcia is currently Professor and Chair of the Education Board at the University of California at Santa Cruz. Dr. Garcia is presently conducting research on effective schools for language minority children, specifically Hispanics. His previous research activities have centered on second language learning and acquisition and cognitive development. He served as Director of the Bilingual-Bicultural Education Center, College of Education, at Arizona State University at Tempe from 1980 to 1987.

This publication was prepared under Contract No. 300860069, for the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA), U.S. Department of Education. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Enrique M. Cubillos, Director

Shelley P. Gutstein, Publications Coordinator

Lorraine Valdez Pierce, Series Editor

Are You Familiar with NCBE Services?

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) responds to your questions related to the education of limited-English-proficient (LEP) populations through:

Information Services

NCBE provides information to practitioners in the field about curriculum materials, program models, methodologies and research findings on the education of limited-English-proficient persons. We continually collect and review materials on bilingual education, English as a second language, refugee education, vocational education, educational technology and related areas.

Electronic Information System

NCBE offers electronic access to its information system at no cost. Users are able to search a database of information containing curriculum materials and literature related to the education of limited-English-proficient students. An electronic bulletin board, which contains news from federal, state and local education agencies, conference announcements and other current information, is also available.

Publications

NCBE develops and publishes three types of publications: a bimonthly newsletter, occasional papers, and program information guides. All publications focus on significant issues related to the education of LEP students.

Contact Us

Contact NCBE by telephone, weekdays between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (EST).

Outside Maryland call: (800) 647-0123.

In Maryland call: (301) 933-9448.

If you prefer to contact us by mail, our address is:

ncbe
the national clearinghouse for bilingual education
11501 Georgia Avenue, Wheaton, Maryland 20902
800-647-0123 • (301) 933-9448